

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Docket-222

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

17 JUN 1993

IN REPLY REFER TO:  
7330-7/1700A3

RECEIVED

JUN 18 1993

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Honorable Bob Krueger  
United States Senator  
961 Federal Building  
Austin, Texas 78701

Dear Senator Krueger:

This is in response to your letter of May 28, 1993, in which you inquired on behalf of your constituent, Mr. Frank Kirman, regarding the Notice of Proposed Rule Making (Notice) in PR Docket No. 92-235, 57 FR 54034 (1992).

Mr. Kirman is specifically concerned about the potential impact of our final rules on radio remote controlled airplane hobbyists.

Model airplane users have shared spectrum on a secondary basis with industrial users for over 25 years. The low power industrial user and the radio control model airplane hobbyists effectively share spectrum through geographic separation. We are enclosing the Report and Order in GEN Docket 82-181, 47 FR 51875 (1982), which provided the current 50 channels for radio controlled model airplanes. These rules, adopted at the behest of the model airplane community, provide no protection from interference from licensed sources. We further note that the radio environment is inherently hazardous and that even primary allocations suffer from problems. For example, model aircraft users receive interference from other model aircraft users and from certain TV channels. Thus, model aircraft must be, and in fact are, capable of co-existing with some interference.

The Commission is seeking to work with all parties on this matter. To this end, FCC staff has met with the two largest industry groups representing model airplane users, the Academy of Model Aeronautics and the Sport Flyers Association, to discuss their concerns and methods of expanding capacity for private land mobile radio users without affecting radio control users. Following the comment and reply comment periods, we will endeavour to adopt reasonable final rules as soon as possible.

We want to thank you for your interest. Your letter will be included in the formal record of this proceeding.

Sincerely,

/s/

Joseph A. Levin  
Chief, Policy and Planning Branch  
Private Radio Bureau

Enclosure

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

241

# Congressional

BOB KRUEGER  
TEXAS

COMMITTEES  
ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES  
COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-4303

May 28, 1993

PRB  
92-235

2399

Mr. Alfred Sikes  
Chairman  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Chairman Sikes:

With regard to our previous correspondence concerning the FCC

May 5, 1993

John Bryant, Congressman  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515-4305

Dear Mr. Bryant:

Thank you for your recent letter in response to my concerns about the potential negative effects of FCC Docket No. 92-235 on the Radio Control model airplane hobby. Yours was the only response that included evidence of direct contact with the FCC (i.e. you did more than just send me a "form letter").

I have reviewed the FCC report dated October 8, 1992 included with your letter, and have the following observations:

1. The reduction in channel spacing from the current 20kHz to the proposed 6.25kHz would **make obsolete** radio equipment on over half the channels currently set aside for and used by Radio Control airplane modelers. Our current equipment, costing many hundreds of dollars, would not be able to reject signals spaced 6.25kHz from our existing channels. This spacing would cause a cessation of much of our current flying, and/or increase the danger from out of control model aircraft.

2. The report states that, as unlicensed secondary users, Radio Control model aircraft hobbyists must accept interference from fixed and mobile users, and may not cause interference to such users. I fail to see the logic or fairness in this attitude. We have petitioned for and actively use these channels. Why should we be treated as second class radio band citizens?

3. The FCC admits that authorized mobile operations under the proposed rules would potentially cause interference with Radio Control operations, although they minimize such likelihood in practice.

4. Finally, the FCC report states that no changes would be required of radio control users. This is not true, and is called into question, if not refuted, in that very same FCC report.

Millions of us across the nation take great joy in various aspects of the radio control hobby. This interest supports an extensive commercial and employment base. I hope you will continue to monitor the FCC actions with a view to helping safeguard the fair and safe use of existing Radio Control channels.

Sincerely



Frank Korman  
5834 Goodwin  
Dallas 75206

cc. James H. Quello, Chairman, FCC  
Phil Gramm, Senator  
Bob Kreuger, Senator ✓